



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,866	04/05/2006	Jorgen J.L. Hoppenbrouwers	GB030184US1	2099
24737	7590	04/01/2011		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS				
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
SAD/O, INSA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com

debbie.henn@philips.com

marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,866

Applicant(s)

HOPPENBROUWERS ET AL.

Examiner

INSA SADIO

Art Unit

2629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 filed on 02/03/2011 has been considered by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claims 1 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As of claims 1 and 8, the Specification as first filed does not provide support for the recitation of claims 1 and 8 “... **at least two first bands**”

Furthermore, the specification as originally filed does not teach one ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant’s claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanauchi et al. (US Publication number 2003/0197472), hereinafter referenced as Kanauchi, in view of Morita (US Publication Number 2002/0196241), and further in view of Ohta et al. (US Publication Number 2007/0033278), hereinafter referenced as Ohta.

As of claim 1, Kanauchi discloses Drive unit and drive method of light-emitting display panel. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said a method of illuminating an active matrix electroluminescent display device comprising an array of display pixels arranged in rows and columns, the method comprising, at any point in time, acts of [simultaneously] illuminating a plurality of rows of pixels, the plurality of [simultaneously] illuminated rows of pixels defining at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels separated by a band of non-illuminated row of pixels (see [0072], fig. 12).

Kanauchi does not teach wherein said **the at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels scrolling in the column direction over time such that the at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels change horizontal position from one time to a next time; and wherein at most 75% of the illuminated rows of pixels are illuminated at any point in time.**

However, Morita teaches the at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels scrolling in the column direction over time such that at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels change horizontal position from one time to a next time; and wherein at most 75% of the illuminated rows are illuminated at any point in time (see fig. 8B, fig. 8C).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi's drive method with the teaching of Morita's scan-

drive circuit to display images, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

Kanauchi as modified by Morita does not teach wherein said simultaneously illuminating row of pixels.

However, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention(see [0105], [0106]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi as modified by Morita's drive method with the teaching of Ohta's scanning system to illuminate rows at the same time, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

As of claim 2, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said each displayed band of illuminated rows of pixels comprises a plurality of adjacent rows of pixels (see paragraph [0072], display region). Further, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention(see [0105], [0106]).

As of claim 3, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said image data for different frames of the image to be displayed are displayed in the different displayed band of illuminated rows of pixels (see paragraph [0078], [0079]). Further, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention (see [0105], [0106]).

As of claim 4, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said each displayed band of illuminated rows of pixels comprises a plurality of sequential alternate rows of pixels (see paragraph [0072], [0073]).

As of claim 5, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Morita teaches wherein said one displayed band of illuminated rows of pixels comprises only odd rows and another displayed band of [simultaneously] illuminated rows of pixels comprises only even rows (see paragraph [0193], [0213]). Further, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention(see [0105], [0106]).

As of claim 6, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 1 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said at most 50% of the rows are illuminated at any point in time (see paragraphs [0072], [0074], (equivalent to partial display)).

As of claim 7, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 6 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said at most 30% of the rows are illuminated at any point in time (see paragraphs [0072], [0074], (equivalent to partial display)).

As of claim 8, Kanauchi discloses Drive unit and drive method of light-emitting display panel. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said An active matrix electroluminescent display device comprising an array of display pixels arranged in rows and columns, and row driver circuitry for illuminating a plurality of rows of pixels (see Fig. 5), the plurality of illuminating rows of pixels defining at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels separated by a band of non- illuminated rows; wherein the row driver

circuitry comprises means for illuminating each row of pixels for at most 75% of a frame period, and wherein at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels scroll in the column direction over time (see Fig. 12).

Kanauchi does not teach wherein said “...**such that at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels change horizontal position from one time to a next time.**”

However, Morita teaches wherein said “...such that at least two displayed bands of illuminated rows of pixels change horizontal position from one time to a next time” (see fig. 8B, fig. 8C).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi's drive method with the teaching of Morita's scan-drive circuit to display images, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

Kanauchi as modified by Morita does not teach wherein said simultaneously illuminating row of pixels.

However, Ohta teaches simultaneously outputting the display scanning signal which is the same as the claimed invention (see [0105], [0106]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kanauchi as modified by Morita's drive method with the teaching of Ohta's scanning system to illuminate rows at the same time, because this is save power from illuminated all the rows at the same time.

As of claim 9, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 8 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said further comprising a frame buffer (22) for storing image data (see Fig. 2 [data driver]).

As of claim 10, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 8 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said the frame buffer stores an amount of data corresponding to a single frame of image data (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

As of claim 11, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 10 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said data is written into the frame buffer (22) progressively frame by frame in sequence, such the frame buffer (22) stores partial data for two adjacent frames, and wherein data is read out from the frame buffer at two locations simultaneously (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

As of claim 12, Kanauchi as modified by Morita and Ohta teaches the imitations of claim 10 above. Further, Kanauchi teaches wherein said the two locations contain data from different adjacent frames of image data (see paragraph [0073], [0076], [0042], Fig. 13).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/03/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argues that "...the at least two first bands scrolling in the column direction over time such that the at least two first bands simultaneously change horizontal position from one time to a next time and image data for different frames of video in different first bands, so that different parts of two adjacent frames are displayed at any one time, wherein at most 75% of the rows of pixels are illuminated at any point

in time", as recited in claim 1 and as substantially recited in claim 8. However, the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertion. The Specification as first filed does not provide support for the recitation of claims 1 and 8 "... **at least two first bands ...**" Furthermore, the specification as originally filed does not teach one ordinary skill in the art how to make or use applicant's claimed invention.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to INSA SADIO whose telephone number is (571)270-5580. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY through FRIDAY 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on 571-272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

INSA SADIO

Art Unit: 2629

Examiner
Art Unit 2629

/INSA SADIO/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amare Mengistu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629